APPENDIX

Vol. 31, No. 49 December 8, 1972

REPORT ON THE 36TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS Columbus, Ohio, October 31-November 3, 1972

[Editor's Note: This report was compiled from reports submitted by Mrs. Arline Custer, John D. Knowlton, Mrs. Mary C. Lethbridge, Mrs. Anita L. Nolen, and Mrs. Carolyn Sung.]

A record number of nearly 600 members attended the 36th annual meeting in Columbus, Ohio, on October 31-November 3. The rain collaborated with President Charles Lee, who had wanted a "working" meeting, by keeping everyone inside the Sheraton-Columbus attending the 40 or more scheduled sessions. The 100-page program, distributed in advance, indicated both the number of sessions and the number of exhibitors were larger this year than at previous meetings. In addition to the usual information about the host city and the meeting, the program will have lasting value as a compendium of useful information about the Society, its history, a roster of past officers and council members, present officers, council, and committees, dates and places of previous conventions with attendance figures, secretary's notes, and brief biographical sketches of nominees for office in 1972.

The council meeting on Tuesday, October 31, was open to membership. At the end of the council's deliberations, the audience participated in discussion, which was useful, although the council members must have been uncomfortable sitting at a table facing the audience and unable to talk naturally to each other. Four concurrent sessions were announced for Tuesday afternoon, of which by far the most popular was "Restrictions on Access to Manuscripts and Archives." With James E. O'Neill of the National Archives and Records Service in the chair, Robert Rosenthal of the University of Chicago, E. Alan Thompson of NARS, and Richard W. Leopold of Northwestern University were to discuss donor restrictions on collections of personal papers, security classification restrictions on governmental records, and attitudes of historians toward restrictions on access. The audience sat on extra chairs placed in the entrance and stood around the walls, but unfortunately none of the Library of Congress contingent was able to obtain a place; Library staff members will have to wait for this session to be reported in a future issue of *The American Archivist.*

At a concurrent session entitled "New Breakthroughs in Paper Research," Gordon R. Williams of the Center for Research Libraries and Chairman of the Society of American Archivists' Ad Hoc Committee on Paper Research reported on the progress of research on the development of standards for permanency and durability of paper and other archival materials. Interim specifications for manifold paper have been developed and work is now going on to prepare such standards for bond paper. The committee expects ultimately to propose standards for other materials including ink and typewriter ribbon. The type of research currently done at the National Bureau of Standards was presented by William Wilson of that institution, who explained the procedures used to test permanency and durability in paper and how the internal composition of the paper and the external conditions such as temperature and humidity affect these qualities. Tests are also being made to determine how the chemical reactions can make an alkaline paper become acid. One of the major needs at present is to develop an accelerated aging process for use in the laboratory. Frazier Poole, Assistant Director for Preservation at the Library of Congress, explained the types of research done there, including restoration of flood damaged material, analysis of stains and discolorations of paper, and experiments with polyester envelopes and other materials as substitutes for the lamination process. During a short discussion period, many members of the audience expressed the need for a list of manufacturers who will produce paper meeting the proposed interim specifications or the brand names of the paper itself, as well as for a manual on methods and techniques of preservation.

Also on the Tuesday afternoon program was "The Effective Use of Audiovisual Records as Primary Sources," chaired by James W. Moore of NARS. Thomas R. Cripps of Morgan State College began with a plea that filmmakers use archives, not early footage available, pointing out the unreliability or lack of veracity in much of this footage—news (the treatment of President Roosevelt's physical disability in newsreels, for example), reenactments, and romantic documentaries such as those of Flaherty. He also

discussed the lack of film for some subjects and periods: World War I, the period between the wars, blacks in the 20's, etc. Mr. Cripps said that was most needed was a published union list of the holdings of various cinema archives.

Eugene Guerny's paper was read in his absence by Joe Thomas of NARS. Although Mr. Guerny is on the staff of the Armed Forces Information Services, he approached the problem of audiovisual records from the point of view of the producer of books for commercial sale. Lamenting the "Individual and organization possessiveness in the administration of visual archives," he aimed vague charges at the Smithsonian Institution and the Library of Congress for having been unwilling to cooperate with authors of books about those institutions; the solution to such possessiveness, he proposed, was to put visual archives under public information offices in all agencies.

John Jellicorse of the University of Tennessee also noted the need for guides and catalogs. He dwelt on the importance of using recorded instead of printed speeches, citing the loss of impact in print of speakers like Al Smith, Presidents Kennedy and Nixon, and Martin Luther King as examples. He also discussed the loss entailed in the destruction of tapes once oral history has been transcribed, the deterioration of much recorded material badly stored or neglected, and the lack of verification or authentication of films and recordings that do exist. Although the University of Tennessee has a new graduate seminar in nonprint materials, students in some institutions are not permitted to cite such original materials as valid research sources. Other problems he said that still need solution are the lack of standards for audiovisual "fair use," adequate cataloging, and techniques for reporting nonprint research.

James P. Pilkington of Vanderbilt University described the Vanderbilt Television News Archive. The Archive, a videotape collection of the evening news broadcasts of the three major television networks beginning August 5, 1968, has been created by videotaping the broadcasts each day off the air as they are broadcast in Nashville. The collection is available for use at the Archive for a nominal viewing fee and on a rental basis for use elsewhere. Mr. Pilkington distributed the April issue of *Television News Index and Abstracts*, a publication still in the experimental stage now distributed on a complimentary basis.

On Wednesday morning there were three concurrent sessions, "Documenting Urban Society," "An Evaluation of Recent State Archives Buildings," and the deceptively-titled "The Invasion of Privacy vs. The Right to Know: The Harding-Phillips Letters." Announced as "a discussion of the issues and implications of the recent agreement of the heirs of Warren G. Harding to donate unpublished letters from Harding to Mrs. Carrie Phillips, 1909-20, to the Library of Congress, with the provision that the letters be sealed until the year 2014," the session really provided a confrontation betweeen Kenneth W. Duckett of Southern Illinois University, formerly of the Ohio Historical Society, and Daniel R. Porter, the Society's Director. Chairman Archie J. Motley of the Chicago Historical Society introduced the session with a resume of the provenance and rediscovery of the Phillips letters; the two panelists presented opposing sides of the story, Porter's a case against Duckett, who was censured by the Society's trustees for violating the Society acquisitions policy and Duckett's a defense in general terms of the historian's need for all documentation of a public man's life. Walter Rundell of the University of Maryland commented on some of the questions raised by the case, the relative importance of the letters to historians, the exclusive use of the letters by one Harding biographer, and ways to deal with boards of trustees and other elected officials. He reminded his audience in his concluding remarks that all archivists and manuscript librarians are probably dealing with stolen property; he prophesied that we can probably never get proper legal title to most of our collections.

One of the Wednesday afternoon sessions was the Joint Session annually sponsored by the American Library Association and the Society of American Archivists. Eileen D. Cooke, then Deputy Director and the Director designate of the Washington Office of the American Library Association, spoke on "Building the Record for the Future," an examination of the Federal legislative process and methods to work with it, including procedures for effective communication with Congress. Warning her listeners, who expressed interest in supporting the proposed National Historic Records Program, that they were embarking on a very long range, if not permanent, enterprise when they started a program of legislative activity, she counseled patience and persistence. Citing examples of ALA legislative activity and the history of bills of interest to libraries and the library profession, she advised how to acquaint individual Members with an organization's views, how to work with staffs, how to work with committees, and how to rally and monitor support from membership. The chairman, Robert Williams of the Florida Division of

Archives, History and Records Management, provided useful advice from his own experience as a legislator.

While these sessions were being held in downtown Columbus, a full program was underway at the campus of Ohio State University all day Wednesday. Included in the morning sessions at the campus was a discussion of "Non-print Media-Film," in which John B. Kuiper of the Library of Congress and Barbara J. Humphrys of the Rhode Island Historical Society took part.

"Careers in Archives" was the subject of discussion at another session held Wednesday morning at the campus and was chaired by K. Austin Kerr of the history department at Ohio State University. Robert M. Warner of the Michigan Historical Collections and Secretary of the Society of American Archivists commented on the present rate of expansion in the profession and the employment pressures placed upon it. He noted that although the profession is expanding at a modest rate, increased pressure is being placed on it from the new interest in archival work expressed by those unable to find jobs in the history and library science professions and, to a lesser extent, from the newly established archival training programs. The somewhat greater expansion in non-professional archives at the local historical society level could also pose a threat to the profession. Dramatic changes could be caused, however, by massive Federal spending for archives.

Douglas Bakken, archivist at Anheuser-Busch in St. Louis, told of the type of things one might encounter in a business archive that would differ from a public or university archive. In addition to the strictly archival duties, an archivist can become involved in many of the firm's other activities, including advertising and public relations.

The status of archivists in the Federal Government was discussed by George Chalou of NARS who reported that the number of archivists employed by the Federal Government has remained relatively stable during the past four years. Almost 85 percent of Federal archivists are employed by the National Archives, and 17 percent of these are women. Most higher level positions are filled by promotion from within, so that those wishing a career at the Federal level would probably have to enter at the lower professional levels. During a discussion period it was pointed out that many people who work with archives and manuscripts in the Federal agencies are not classified in the archivist series by the Civil Service Commission, but are called by such titles as historian, social scientist, librarian, or curator.

Two major papers were delivered at the one afternoon session at the campus, "The Historian's Use of Archives," by Thomas D. Clark of Indiana University, and "The Archivist's Use of History," by Maynard J. Brichford of the University of Illinois Archives. This session was chaired by Harry L. Coles, Chairman of the Department of History of Ohio State University, who was once on the staff of the National Archives. The University Archives and the History Department gave a reception for SAA members at the Faculty Club following the afternoon session.

The first business meeting, the first anticipated confrontation between the insurgents and the SAA establishment, on Wednesday evening considered the Committee of the 1970's report and voted on proposed amendments to the constitution. The proposed amendments, all of which had been printed in the July/October issue of *The American Archivist*, concerned membership, individual, institutional, and honorary, and the election of fellows; one provided for the conversion of the secretary, an elected official, into the appointed executive director of the Society. All proposals were adopted by the membership, although the last cannot be implemented until funds are available. Revisions in the bylaws approved by the Council on the basis of the Committee's recommendations were considered next. With a considerable amount of discussion, the proposed Article 7 (which appeared on pp. 364-5 of the journal) was amended to delete the first sentence of paragraph 3, to substitute (also paragraph 3) "national origin, citizenship," for "nationality," to substitute (paragraph 4) "by submission of" for "submitting," to add (paragraph 5) "or she" to the phrase "he intends to deal with them," and to provide that biographies and statements of candidates should accompany the ballots sent to individual members. Article 8 (p. 366) was adopted after it was amended to provide that the committee on professional standards consist of the seven most recent former presidents of the Society. The meeting also adopted a motion to have the Council draft a resolution of policy on discrimination in the profession for submission to the next annual meeting.

On Thursday morning, the well-attended session on "Women in Archives," chaired by Lynn B. Donovan of the California Historical Society, focused on the status of women archivists, feminist activities of professional women, sources for the study of women in America, and trends in Women's Studies. Mabel E. Deutrich of the National Archives and Records Service in her paper "Ms. vs Mr. Archivist: Status of

Women in the Archival Profession" reported on her preliminary study based on *The American Archivist* and a sampling of the Society's recent membership survey. She noted that women, although they make-up one-third of the Society's membership, have never received proportional professional recognition as represented by appearance on the program of the annual meeting or receiving awards. Tables documenting these and other interpretations were distributed. Elsie F. Freivogel of the Archives of American Art in her paper "Women on the Move: Activities in the Professions" presented an overview of the activities of various professional women's caucuses and distributed numerous publications and a fact sheet, "Working Women: Their Work Characteristics, Their Jobs, Their Earnings, and the Limits on Their Aspiration," which challenges some of the fallacies regarding women professionals. Diane M. Dorsey of Radcliffe College spoke about the women's collection at Radcliffe and at other repositories and discussed trends and problems created for the archivist by the increased research in women's history in her paper "Documenting the History of Women in America." Joanna Schneider Zangrando of the University of Akron explored the trends in Women's Studies in her paper "Historian's Search for Sources for Women's Studies." Due to the lack of time, Miriam I. Crawford of Temple University did not make a formal presentation, but limited her remarks to commenting on some key issues for women archivists, including the recommendation that the Society form a committee on the status of women in the profession.

At the Presidential Banquet on Thursday evening President Charles Lee delivered a particularly graceful address in which he recalled some of the places and persons evoked by maps, treaties, and other archives. In the course of his address he paid tribute to members of the profession who had eased his transition from history professor to archivist, among them the late Philip M. Hamer, Wayne Grover, and Mary Bryan, and–present at the banquet–Ernst Posner, Oliver W. Holmes, and James B. Rhoads.

Friday morning was devoted to ten workshops at the magnificent Ohio Historical Center, home of the Ohio Historical Society. The Workshop on Finding Aids was chaired by Edward G. Campbell, National Archives and Records Service, who announced that the general topic to be discussed, without prepared papers, by the panelists with audience participation, was to cover the creation of general repository guides and the preparation of inventory/registers of archival holdings and personal papers; creation of user-oriented finding aids at every level of the descriptive process; and characteristics researchers want and need in archival finding aids. He called first on Mrs. Shirley L. Greene, a professional researcher from Bethesda, Md., who specializes in picture research but equated her requirements with the archival/manuscript needs. Her projected "ideal" would be computerization, she said. Murphy D. Smith of the American Philosophical Society, and Samuel A. Sizer of the University of Arkansas, described the systems of finding aids used in their respective institutions and, in general, expressed the belief that, for the type of institution, the kind and amount of records, and the various reference and retrieval demands received, each system worked satisfactorily. However, both admitted that unlimited funds would permit refinement, greater depth of description, better retrieval, and wider dissemination of information outside the repository. Edward C. Papenfuse of the American Historical Association, speaking from the point of view of a researcher, wanted available complete descriptions of each collection in a repository, guides to all collections in a repository, and a national listing of registers and guides. He said he regretted the negative inference and his use of the word "failure" in regard to the value of the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections program in a recent article in the *AHA Newsletter.* He said he likes the descriptions but would prefer arrangement of entries by repository. Mrs. Arline Custer, Editor of the NUCMC, Library of Congress, explained that the order of listing is determined by the pattern of year-round work and that to overcome the lack of alphabetizing or repository grouping three lists are included in each volume: (1) a list by state and city of contributing repositories, (2) a guide to entry numbers by repository, and (3) a short-entry form list of collections by repository. Mrs. Custer also took the opportunity to tell the group that the Society's Committee on Techniques for the Control and Description of Archives and Manuscripts which is chaired by Frank G. Burke, had completed a year's work drafting a manual for guidance in the preparation of registers and inventories, and that its project for the coming year is to prepare a bibliography of general guides to repositories.

Charles G. LaHood, Jr., Chief of the Library's Photoduplication Service, chaired a Workshop on Microfilm Applications and Standards which took up archival uses and applications of microfilm, equipping and operating a small microfilm laboratory, and standards for administering a microfilm program that

meets archival specifications. Peter A. Waters, the Library's Restoration Officer, took part in a Workshop on Paper Conservation Techniques. Held in the Historical Society's Paper Conservation Laboratory, it was planned to help small institutions with limited budgets accomplish the necessary paper preservation procedures.

John D. Knowlton, Head of the Preparation Section in the Manuscript Division, participated in a Workshop on Internal Archival Controls held on Friday at the Ohio Historical Society. Chaired by Robert Westmore of the Provincial Archives of Ontario, the panel included Warner W. Pflug of Wayne State University and Marietta Malzer of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries. Each panel member spoke briefly on the various forms and controls used in their administrative procedures and then the floor was opened to questions. Primarily audience interest focused on manuscript repositories and how their operations handled functions which records managers perform for archivists.

C. F. W. Ciker, Director of the Division of Archives and Records of the North Carolina Department of Art, Culture and History, chaired a very practical Workshop on Public Relations. The panel consisted of Don E. Weaver, retired editor of the Columbus *Citizen-Journal* and a trustee of the Ohio Historical Society, Mrs. Mary C. Lethbridge, Information Officer of the Library of Congress, Louis George Griffin III of the University of Kansas, and Richard Haupt, former director of the Cincinnati Historical Society.

The main business of the second and last business meeting was the election of officers, which got underway almost immediately after the session was called to order. Candidates had been polled by a group of over 50 SAA members who had distributed their responses to six questions–about equal employment opportunity, accreditation of archivists, young members of the profession and their involvement in the Society, and restrictions on Federal archives–in an *ACT Newsletter.* Runoff elections were required for all but one of the contested seats and the voting was not completed until after a large Washington-based group had had to leave for late afternoon planes. The results which became known later were that F. Gerald Ham, State Archivist and Head of the Division of Archives and Manuscripts, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, was elected Vice President, Howard L. Applegate, Executive Director of the Balch Institute, Philadelphia, was elected Treasurer, Elsie F. Freivogel, Assistant Curator of Manuscripts, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, gained the first council seat, and Richard C. Berner, Head of the Archives and Manuscripts Division, University of Washington, gained the second. Since the office of Secretary had been converted by the action of the first business meeting to an appointed office of Executive Director, there was no vote for this office; Robert M. Warner is expected to continue to carry out the duties until a paid director is appointed. All these officers will serve with the President who took office at the meeting, Wilfred I. Smith, Dominion Archivist of Canada.